



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,196	07/02/2003	Keith FitzPatrick	930036-2008	4118
20999	7590	08/04/2008	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151				PIZIALI, ANDREW T
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,196	FITZPATRICK, KEITH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew T. Piziali	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-13 and 32-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/11/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-13 and 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-13, 39 and 40, the applicant claims that each individual preformed layer is a textile layer "first" coated/impregnated with a resin or rubber material, but the applicant does specify a subsequent step(s). It is not clear what additional step(s) the claimed "first" step occurs prior thereto.

Regarding claims 1-13, 39 and 40, the phrase "coated/impregnated" renders the claims indefinite. It is not clear if said phrase refers to the combination of coating and impregnating, or refers to coating and impregnating as alternatives.

Regarding claims 32-38, the phrase “papermaker’s process belt” renders the claims indefinite. It is not clear if the belt is a papermaking belt or if the belt is simply a process belt that may be owned and/or used by a papermaker.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-11, 13 and 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over USPN 5,753,085 to FitzPatrick.

Regarding claims 1-11, 13 and 32-40, FitzPatrick discloses a long nip press belt for a papermaking machine comprising a textile substrate comprising a plurality of individual layers impregnated and coated on both sides with a polymeric resin (see entire document including Figure 6, column 3, line 57 through column 4, line 15, and column 5, lines 38-49). The textile substrate includes textile components such as monofilaments, continuous fine filaments or staple fibers having non-circular cross sections with a plurality of lobes (column 4, lines 27-31). The laminate is held together by chemical bonding (abstract). The textile can be woven and/or

nonwoven (column 4, lines 11-15). The polymeric resin material may be polyurethane (column 3, lines 63 and 64). The filaments may be interwoven from machine direction and cross-machine direction (column 4, lines 64-67).

It is the examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden has been shifted to the applicant to show an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,753,085 to FitzPatrick as applied to claims 1-11, 13 and 32-40 above, and further in view of EP 0 960 975 to Davenport.

FitzPatrick appears to be silent regarding the outer surface having grooves or blind-drilled holes, but Davenport discloses that it is known in the art to supply the substrate with grooves or blind-drilled holes for the temporary storage of water (see entire document including [0031] and [0032]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include grooves or blind-drilled holes in the substrate, motivated by a desire to supply the substrate with temporary storage of water.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that FitzPatrick fails to teach or suggest first coating/impregnating each layer and then combining the layers to form a substrate. The applicant alleges that FitzPatrick teaches combining the layers and then coating/impregnating the combined structure. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the applicant has failed to show, or attempt to show, that the process disclosed by FitzPatrick results in a patentably distinct structure.

It is the examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden has been shifted to the applicant to show an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The applied prior art either anticipated or strongly suggested the claimed subject matter.

The applicant asserts that Fitzpatrick does not teach or suggest a multi-layer structure. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 6 clearly illustrates a multi-layer structure.

In response, the applicant asserts that the layers of Figure 6 are individual preformed layers prior to being impregnated, but that once said layers are impregnated with one polymeric

resin material the layers are no longer "individual preformed layers." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 specifically states that an impregnating material is "part of each of said individual preformed layers."

The applicant asserts that Fitzpatrick does not teach or suggest a multi-layer structure. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 5 illustrates a multi-layer structure as evidenced by the Figure being referred to as a "multi-layer weave."

In response, the applicant asserts that the multilayer weave of Figure 5 does not include a plurality of individual preformed layers that are first coated/impregnated, because the layers are interwoven. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the applicant has failed to show, or attempt to show, that the process disclosed by FitzPatrick results in a patentably distinct structure.

It is the examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden has been shifted to the applicant to show an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The applied prior art either anticipated or strongly suggested the claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew T Piziali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794